

Remarks:

Claims 1-15 remain for consideration in this application.

In the Office Action Summary sheet, it is stated that claims 1-15 are rejected. However, the Office Action states that claims 22-45 have been rejected. It is assumed that this is merely a typographical error, and that the rejection is of claims 1-15. A phone message left by the Examiner confirmed that this was the case.

Thus, claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Woods, U.S. Patent No. 6,217,612. Woods discloses an intraocular lens implant having an optic and an optic positioning member formed of a resilient material. As is evident from a review of Figs. 1 and 2, the lens generally conforms to the shape of the natural capsule 22. The optic of the '612 reference is thus positioned adjacent the anterior wall 58 of the natural capsule 22 of the eye. Indeed, the reference states that "the lens 38 is of sufficient size so that optic 40 mildly urges against the anterior wall 58 of the capsule 22, while the posterior side 53 of the lens 38 urges against the posterior wall 60 of the capsule 22." (Col. 4, lines 22-26). The accommodation of the lens in the '612 reference is achieved by the axial travel of the optic as the horizontal depth of the lens changes in response to changes in the horizontal depth of the natural capsule.

By contrast, Applicant's claim 1 is directed to an implantable intraocular lens comprising, among other things, an optic and an optic positioning member including anterior and posterior segments, said optic being connected to said positioning member in a location central to said anterior and posterior segments.

The '612 patent never teaches nor suggests an optic being connected to a positioning member in a location *central to anterior and posterior segments*. To the contrary, the '612 reference teaches a resilient body 46 comprising an outer wall 48 which extends radially from an optic 40. Resilient body 46 is preferably *integral and essentially flush with* optic 40 at optic perimeter 50 where wall 48 joins optic 40. ('612 patent, column 4, lines 8-11.) Rather than an optic being connected in a location central to anterior and posterior segments, the '612 patent teaches that *the optic 40 mildly urges against the anterior wall 58* of the capsule 22. This location is clearly seen in FIGS. 1 and 2, in which the optic 40 is positioned towards the *anterior* wall 58 of the capsule 22. ('612 patent, column 4, lines 51-52.)

At least because the '612 patent does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and further define the invention of claim 1. Thus, claims 2-15 are patentable over the '612 patent at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable thereover, and are patentable in their own right as well.

In light of the foregoing, it is believed that the Applicant is entitled to a Notice of Allowance, and such is respectfully requested. Any additional fee which is due in connection with this Response should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Tracy Bornman, Reg. No. 42,347
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
816/474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS